

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ANDY and SUSAN NAVA,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 3:16-cv-0082-LRH-VPC

ORDER

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; NATIONAL
DEFAULT SERVICING CORPORATION,

Defendants.

On December 31, 2015, plaintiffs Andy and Susan Nava (“the Navas”) filed a complaint for wrongful foreclosure against defendants. See ECF No. 1, Exhibit 1.¹ On February 19, 2016, defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”) removed the action to this court (ECF No. 1). Subsequent to removal, Wells Fargo filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 7), a motion to stay (ECF No. 9) seeking a stay of discovery until a ruling upon the motion to dismiss, and a response to plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction; all of these documents were filed on February 26, 2016. On June 30, 2016, the court issued its Order (ECF No. 18) to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to respond to substantive filings

The court granted plaintiffs twenty (20) days from the entry of that order to show cause why the present action should not be dismissed in its entirety for failure to respond to substantive filings.

¹ Refers to the court’s docket entry number.

1 It was further ordered that a substantive response to the motion to dismiss by
2 defendant Wells Fargo (ECF No. 7) should be filed on or before the twenty (20) day
3 deadline from the entry of that order.

4 To date, no filing by plaintiffs has been docketed in response to the court's Order
5 (ECF No. 18). Good cause appearing,

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is dismissed in its entirety.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED this 1st day of August, 2016.

10
11 
12 LARRY R. HICKS
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28